

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| NAKISHA JACKSON, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | C.A. No. 22-364 (MN) |
| |) | |
| META PLATFORMS, INC., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

MEMORANDUM ORDER

At Wilmington, this 10th day of October 2023;


1. **Introduction.** Plaintiff proceeds *pro se*. On March 16, 2023, this Court granted Defendant’s motion to dismiss, concluding that Plaintiff had failed to state a claim, and denied Plaintiff’s motions for default and default judgment. (D.I. 13, 14). Plaintiff moves for reconsideration. (D.I. 15).

2. **Discussion.** The standard for obtaining relief under Rule 59(e) is difficult for a plaintiff to meet. The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to “correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” *Max’s Seafood Café ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999). “A proper Rule 59(e) motion . . . must rely on one of three grounds: (1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or fact or to prevent manifest injustice.” *Lazaridis v. Wehmer*, 591 F.3d 666, 669 (3d Cir. 2010) (citing *N. River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reinsurance Co.*, 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995)). A motion for reconsideration is not properly grounded on a request that a court rethink a decision already made. *See Glendon Energy Co. v. Borough of Glendon*, 836 F. Supp. 1109, 1122 (E.D. Pa. 1993). Motions for reargument or reconsideration may not be used “as a means to argue new facts or issues that inexcusably were

not presented to the court in the matter previously decided.” *Brambles USA, Inc. v. Blocker*, 735 F. Supp. 1239, 1240 (D. Del. 1990). Reargument, however, may be appropriate where “the Court has patently misunderstood a party, or has made a decision outside the adversarial issues presented to the court by the parties, or has made an error not of reasoning but of apprehension.” *Brambles USA*, 735 F. Supp. at 1241 (D. Del. 1990) (citations omitted); *See also* D. Del. LR 7.1.5.

3. This Court has reviewed and considered Plaintiff’s motion. She has failed to set forth any intervening changes in controlling law, new evidence, or clear errors of law or fact made by the Court to warrant granting reconsideration. *See Max’s Seafood Café*, 176 F.3d at 677. Therefore, the motion will be denied.

4. **Conclusion.** THEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (D.I. 15) is DENIED.



The Honorable Maryellen Noreika
United States District Judge